

REMARKS

This is a request for continued examination under 37 C.F.R. §1.114. The fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e) is included. A response to the final office action issued Oct. 31, 2007 is included.

The correspondence address and Attorney of Record have been changed. A power of attorney and change of correspondence address form is included with this response. The examiner is kindly requested to enter this information into the record.

The applicant has amended the specification to reflect the correct chain of priority. Reference is made to patent 7,xxx,xxx in this amendment. This is because all pending claims in application 09/792,323 have been allowed, and the issue fee has been paid. However, at the time of this response, the new patent number is still unknown. The applicant will correct this in the next correspondence with the examiner.

At the time of the above-mentioned office action, claims 28-77 were pending in the application. The applicant has amended claims 28-37, cancelled claims 38-77 and added new claims 78-117. The claims currently pending are thus claims 28-37 and 78-117. The applicant previously had 50 claims with 6 independent claims. The applicant continues to have 50 claims with 6 independent claims.

In the above-mentioned final office action, the examiner rejected all of the then-pending claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 28-68 and 73-77 were rejected as being unpatentable over Lawlor et al. in view of Chelliah et al. Claims

69-72 were rejected as being unpatentable over Lawlor in view of Chelliah in further view of Mathews. Claims 69-72 have been cancelled. The applicant will address the first rejection as it applies to claims 28-37 as amended.

Claims 28-37 and new claims 78-117 are patentable over Lawlor in view of Chelliah:

The Lawlor et al. reference (U.S. 5,870,724) ("Lawlor") does not teach a real-time transaction on the World Wide Web where a transaction request from an end user is made for a transactional service from a plurality of transactional services managed by a web merchant, content provider or context provider on the World Wide Web. Rather Lawlor teaches dedicated telephone-based banking terminals for users at home or in the office. (Lawlor, Col. 6, lines 62-64). Lawlor does not teach any use of a virtual information store or routing of an object associated with a web media content service. In fact, Lawlor does not teach objects at all, and the word object referring to a data object does not appear in the Lawlor patent.

In the office action, the examiner stated that Lawlor teaches a web based merchant in the form of online payees. However, online payees are people attempting to bank using Lawlor's invention, not merchants. The common meaning of the word merchant means someone selling something. Lawlor's online payees do not sell anything. The examiner cites Fig. 1 of Lawlor for online payees; however, this term does not appear on Fig. 1.

The examiner states that Lawlor's menu item is an object associated with a transactional service. The applicant's claim calls for routing a network object. Lawlor's menu item is simply a static list and is not an object. An object generally contains both data and methods. Lawlor's menu item contains only data, and Lawlor fails to teach routing of any object.

The examiner cites Chelliah et al. ("Chelliah") to provide an interface that exposes a same set of business functionalities. While it is the applicant's opinion that Chelliah does not teach this, this limitation has been deleted from the pending claims, and hence the use of Chelliah in this case is no longer relevant. In any case, Chelliah only teaches a rudimentary transaction system with no virtual information store and no routing of network objects.

The Matthews reference was not used to reject claims 28-37 and will therefore not be discussed.

The applicant respectively contends that with respect to amended claims 28-37, the examiner cannot make out a prima facie case of obviousness with the references cited. The applicant has added new claims 78-177. None of the references cited teach or render obvious these new claims.

The applicant believes that for the reasons stated above, claims 28-37 and new claims 78-117 are allowable. The examiner is respectfully requested to place the case in condition for allowance at the earliest convenience.